

Serial No. 09/539848

Amendment dated January 30, 2004

Response to Office Action dated September 30, 2003

Page 5 of 7

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 were pending and examined. The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldstein (USPN 6,374,287). The Examiner also rejected claims 6-12 and 20-21 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lefebvre (USPN 6,249,294). The Examiner rejected claims 2-5 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldstein in view of Lefebvre. The Examiner rejected claims 13-19 and 22 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebvre in view of Goldstein. In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1-8, 12, and 13, canceled claims 10, 11, 17 and 18, and added new claim 23. Claims 1-9, 12-16, and 19-23 are pending.

Claim rejections under 35 USC §§ 102(e), 103(a)

The Examiner rejected independent claim 1 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Goldstein and independent claims 6 and 12 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Lefebvre. In response to these rejections, Applicant has amended each of the independent claims to recite that the claimed invention is directed at enabling a user on a local terminal to execute shell commands on a remote host. Support for these amendments is found in the specification at the paragraph beginning on page 7, line 26. Applicant submits that the limitations recited in the independent claims as amended herein are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

The cited references do not render the independent claims unpatentable because the cited references fail to teach all of the limitations of the amended independent claims. An anticipation rejection is appropriate only when all of a claim's limitations are taught by a single reference and an obviousness rejection is appropriate only when the cited references taken together teach all of the limitations of the invention. Goldstein and Lefebvre do not disclose or suggest a method or system enabling the execution of shell commands on a remote host using a window server or display server as an intermediary. The relevant portions of Lefebvre are concerned with a method and system for execution graphic commands on the graphics hardware of a remote host in a way that achieves desirable performance. Thus, the relevant portions of the Lefebvre, including the portions cited by the Examiner, describe the system by which Lefebvre enables

Serial No. 09/539848

Amendment dated January 30, 2004

Response to Office Action dated September 30, 2003

Page 6 of 7

OpenGL commands issued by a local application to be executed in graphics hardware on a remote host. The relevant portion of Goldstein describes a conventional X Window System and Server wherein a user interacts with a GUI and the GUI events are reported to a client application that may be located on another host. Neither of these types of remote command execution is anticipates or suggests the ability to execute shell commands on the remote system. X Windows Systems and other display servers are designed specifically to interact with GUI software and hardware in a distributed or networked environment. By using the facilities provided by a display server (such as an X Window Server) to permit a text string to be passed to a remote host and executed as a shell command, the invention achieves functionality that expands the boundaries of a conventional display server system. Specifically, in the absence of the present mechanism, it is necessary to invoke some other mechanism, such as Telnet, to do command line or shell command execution on a remote host. In applications where a display server system is already present, it is undesirable to require an additional application to enable shell command execution. Moreover, in host systems that implement access authorization, display server access privileges are independent of the Telnet access privileges. Thus, a user is required to gain access (password, etc.) to the display server to invoke distributed GUI functionality and further required to acquire access to the remote server desktop to execute remote shell commands using another mechanism, such as a Telnet logon sequence. The present invention, as recited in new claim 23, uses a common access authorization to enable both types of tasks remotely.

Because the cited references do not disclose or suggest the limitation of the independent claims as amended herein applicant would respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the independent claims and all remaining claims depending thereon.

In the present response, Applicant has responded to the Examiner's rejection of the pending claims under 35 USC §§ 102(e), 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant believes that this response constitutes a complete response to each of the issues raised in the office action. In light of the amendments made herein and the accompanying remarks, Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant would request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections, allow the pending claims, and advance the application to

Serial No. 09/539848

Amendment dated January 30, 2004

Response to Office Action dated September 30, 2003

Page 7 of 7

issue. If the Examiner has any questions, comments, or suggestions, the undersigned attorney would welcome and encourage a telephone conference at 512.428.9872.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph P. Lally

Reg. No. 38,947

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

P.O. Box 684749

Austin, Texas 78768-4749

512.428.9870

512.428.9871 (FAX)

JPL/mmm

